

Jan 30, 2018

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

KYNTREL JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

SHAWNA PATZKOWSKI; R.
ZARAGOZA,

Defendant.

No. 4:17-CV-05189-SMJ

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Before the Court, without oral argument, is Plaintiff Kyntrel Jackson's construed Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 23. Plaintiff sent a letter to the Court Clerk titled "Request Defendants to be placed back in civil action." The Court has reviewed the motion and case file and construes this motion as a motion for reconsideration of its January 12, 2018 Order Dismissing Complaint in Part and Directing Service of Religious Claims. ECF No. 12. On January 12, 2018, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint. ECF No. 15. The Court screened the amended complaint and issued a screening order, Order Dismissing Amended Complaint in Part and Dismissing Service of Religious Claims on January, 19, 2018. ECF No. 21. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for consideration as it relates to the Court's January 12, 2018 order on the original complaint is moot.

1 However, Plaintiff's amended complaint was substantially identical to the
2 original complaint with the exception of an added claim under the Universal
3 Declaration of Human Rights and a construed negligence claim against Chaplain
4 Fred Ivey. *See* ECF No. 15. The Court's January 19, 2018 screening order dismissed
5 the same claims and defendants for the same reasons, in addition to dismissing the
6 new claim under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the claim against
7 Defendant Ivey. ECF No. 21. Because Plaintiff's construed motion for
8 reconsideration applies equally to the Court's January 19, 2018 screening order, the
9 Court will consider Plaintiff's motion as it applies to the operative amended
10 complaint and screening order.


11 In his motion for reconsideration, Plaintiff asserts that Defendants Aiyeku,
12 Caldwell, Gonzales, Snyder, Sundburg, Holbrook, Roberts, Mink, Schettler,
13 Schneider, and Vernell should remain as defendants. Plaintiff presents no new facts
14 or information for the Court to consider in evaluating his requests. Plaintiff's motion
15 essentially summarizes the allegations made in his complaint (and amended
16 complaint) and asserts that he has "evidence to prove all claims if need be yet was
17 denied to even show evidence in any court related manner." Seeing no reason to
18 disturb previous decisions, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

1. Plaintiff's Construed Motion for Reconsideration, **ECF No. 23**, is
DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The Clerk's Office is directed to enter this Order and
provide copies to counsel and pro se party.

DATED this 30th day of January 2018.



SALVADOR MENDOZA, JR.
United States District Judge